MARX AND ENGELS

HIGHLIGHTS

WRITTEN ON BEHALF OF:

COMMUNISM RECLAIMED

Introduction

The creation of these walls of texts was backed by the intention of providing accurate sources and interpretations of the works by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In a world where Communism had lost its revolutionary potential entirely due to it being the victim of intense propaganda, all mentions of Communism point towards its association with regimes and tragedies that were labelled as the result of the praxis of Communism. In reality however, alot of these Societies have absolutely nothing to do with the program laid forth by Communism, not in terms of origins or overall praxis. The contents featured in this work will be a basic run-through of the common, misinformed critique of the Marxist programme accompanied by the sources directly pulled from the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

which will then be used to come up with a proper and concise interpretation of the Marxist programme and we will then see how accurate the modern day information of Marxism really is based on the following portions of their [Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels] works:

The Materialist concept of ideas and culture (Morality being the offshoot of the present day mode of production)

The Marxist concept of human nature (Critique Alienation and Morality)

The Marxist concept of Communism (The Communal, Classless Society based on Free Association)

The Marxist revolutionary program (The Proletarian State)

THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF MORALITY

The rigid conservation of Reactionary policies, which in all scenarios tends to serve the Philistinistic Classes through the oppression of Lower Social Classes is almost always backed up by the excuse that it aims to "uphold the conditions which allow eternal truths to THRIVE." The eternal truths are seen by the Reaction as invaluable virtues of Society which must be preserved. It is through propaganda made to install in the Working Classes a form of "false consciousness", that the Reaction always creates an ideology of "Objective Virtues" which the Working Class must follow, and one which always benefits the Reaction at the expense of Working Class interests. The virtues that are obedience, humility, productivity and religious devotion are morals which the Reactionary class almost always never follows, because they are ideologies which applies only to install a perfect mindset in a Workers' conscious.

The irony of these "eternal truths" is that while they are labelled as inevitable, the lengths by which the Reaction will go in order to preserve the conditions that allow these virtues to be applied in praxis also goes to show that they actually are aware of the fact that these virtues are far from being "Iron Laws", but on the other hand, extremely elastic. The Marxist critique of the German Ideology particularly calls out the fallacies of eternal truths, stating the followings:

As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production.

The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the mental intercourse of men, appear at this stage as the direct efflux of their material behaviour.

The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.

It is alo stated in Friedrich Engels' "Principles of Communism":

– 21 –

What will be the influence of communist society on the family?
It will transform the relations between the sexes into a purely private matter which concerns only the persons involved and into which society has no occasion to intervene. It can do this since it does away with private property and educates children on a communal basis, and in this way removes the two bases of traditional marriage – the dependence rooted in private property, of the women on the man, and of the children on the parents.

And here is the answer to the outcry of the highly moral philistines against the "community of women". Community of women is a condition which belongs entirely to bourgeois society and which today finds its complete expression in prostitution. But prostitution is based on private property and falls with it. Thus, communist society, instead of introducing community of women, in fact abolishes it.

– 22 –

What will be the attitude of communism to existing nationalities?
The nationalities of the peoples associating themselves in accordance with the principle of community will be compelled to mingle with each other as a result of this association and thereby to dissolve themselves, just as the various estate and class distinctions must disappear through the abolition of their basis, private property.[3]

– 23 –

What will be its attitude to existing religions?
All religions so far have been the expression of historical stages of development of individual peoples or groups of peoples. But communism is the stage of historical development which makes all existing religions superfluous and brings about their disappearance

In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels had also stated the following details:

All objections urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, &c. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property – historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production – this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.
Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conception, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life? What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.
When people speak of the ideas that revolutionise society, they do but express that fact that within the old society the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical, and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change."

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involved the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

In summary therefore, as a response to the Reactionary concept of "eternal truths", it was already stressed enough by the fact that all senses of Morality of te present day is nothing but the ideology of the current mode of production, and the ideology of te ruling Class which this mode of production [Capitalism] reproduces, and one which will disappear as soon s the conditions [mode of production] gets overthrown.

THE MARXIST THEORY OF HUMAN ENLIGHTENMENT

It is because of the mainstream bastardisation of all things Marxism related, the Marxist conception of human enlightenment is not the exception either, although it is not nearly as much of a focus by mainstream media to talk about the Marxist conception of human enlightenment, it is still relevant in that it serves as the ultimate motivation behind the Revolutionary, Scientific Socialist movement and can provide a proper view of the Class Interests of the Proletariats. In the 1844 Manuscripts of Karl Marx, he had stated these regarding the Philosophical critique of Political Economy:

> *Thus political economy – despite its worldly and voluptuous appearance – is a true moral science, the most moral of all the sciences. Self-renunciation, the renunciation of life and of all human needs, is its principal thesis. The less you eat, drink and buy books; the less you go to the theatre, the dance hall, the public house; the less you think, love, theorise, sing, paint, fence, etc., the more you save – the greater becomes your treasure which neither moths nor rust will devour – your capital. The less you are, the less you express your own life, the more you have, i.e., the greater is your alienated life, the greater is the store of your estranged being.*

In the German Ideology Marx and Engels go into further detail regarding the Communist definition of enlightenment by replying to the common critique of Communism for supposedly advocating a rigid form of "Collectivism":

Communism is quite incomprehensible to our saint because the communists do not oppose egoism to selflessness or selflessness to egoism, nor do they express this contradiction theoretically either in its sentimental or 'it its high-flown ideological form; they rather demonstrate its material source, with which it disappears of itself. The communists do not preach morality at all, as Stirner does so extensively. They do not put to people the moral demand: love one another, do not be egoists, etc.; on the contrary, they are very well aware that egoism, just as much as selflessness, is in definite circumstances a necessary form of the self-assertion of individuals. Hence, the communists by no means want, as Saint Max believes, and as his loyal Dottore Graziano (Arnold Ruge) repeats after him (for which Saint Max calls him "an unusually cunning and politic mind", Wigand, p. 192), to do away with the "private individual" for the sake of the "general", selfless man.

They know that this contradiction is only a seeming one because one side of it, what is called the "general interest", is constantly being produced by the other side, private interest, and in relation to the latter it is by no means an independent force with an independent history — so that this contradiction is in practice constantly destroyed and reproduced. Hence it is not a question of the Hegelian "negative unity" of two sides of a contradiction, but of the materially determined destruction of the preceding materially determined mode of life of individuals, with the disappearance of which this contradiction together with its unity also disappears.

The only reason why Christianity wanted to free us from the domination of the flesh and "desires as a driving force" was because it regarded our flesh, our desires as something foreign to us; it wanted to free us from determination by nature only because it regarded our own nature as not belonging to us. For if I myself am not nature, if my natural desires, my whole natural character, do not belong to myself — and this is the doctrine of Christianity — then all determination by nature — whether due to my own natural character or to what is known as external nature — seems to me a determination by something foreign, a fetter, compulsion used against me, heteronomy as opposed to autonomy of the spirit. Stirner accepts this Christian dialectic without examining it and then applies it to our spirit. Incidentally, Christianity has indeed never succeeded in freeing us from the domination of desires, even in that juste milieu sense foisted on it by Saint Max; it does not go beyond mere moral injunctions, which remain ineffective in real life. Stirner takes moral injunctions for real deeds and supplements them with the further categorical imperative: "We should indeed possess spirit, but spirit should not possess us" — and consequently all his egoism in agreement with itself is reduced "on closer examination", as Hegel would say, to a moral philosophy that is as delightful as it is edifying and contemplative.

It is from these sources that we get a clear picture of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' concept of human Freedom, as man pursuing his genuine passion and creative life activity free from external coercion. This is in summary the acknowledgement of "True Individualism", and it is also why Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels opposed what they deemed "Superstitious Authoritarianism", that is the submission to dogmatic senses of Morality.

In summary, not only therefore is Marxism's concept of Human Freedom far from Collectivist in nature, it in every way opposes Collectivism.

The Marxist concept of Communism

It should be obvious by now that ideologically, Marxism is opposed to every single case of “Actually Existing Socialism”, which itself can be characterised as being Collectivist and Statist in nature. The Communist Society envisioned by Marx and Engels then, can be found in their following works. In the Principles of Communism by Friedrich Engels, he had stated:

Above all, it will have to take the control of industry and of all branches of production out of the hands of mutually competing individuals, and instead institute a system in which all these branches of production are operated by society as a whole – that is, for the common account, according to a common plan, and with the participation of all members of society.
It will, in other words, abolish competition and replace it with association.
Moreover, since the management of industry by individuals necessarily implies private property, and since competition is in reality merely the manner and form in which the control of industry by private property owners expresses itself, it follows that private property cannot be separated from competition and the individual management of industry. Private property must, therefore, be abolished and in its place must come the common utilization of all instruments of production and the distribution of all products according to common agreement – in a word, what is called the communal ownership of goods.

The form of the division of labor which makes one a peasant, another a cobbler, a third a factory worker, a fourth a stock-market operator, has already been undermined by machinery and will completely disappear. Education will enable young people quickly to familiarize themselves with the whole system of production and to pass from one branch of production to another in response to the needs of society or their own inclinations. It will, therefore, free them from the one-sided character which the present-day division of labor impresses upon every individual. Communist society will, in this way, make it possible for its members to put their comprehensively developed faculties to full use. But, when this happens, classes will necessarily disappear. It follows that society organized on a communist basis is incompatible with the existence of classes on the one hand, and that the very building of such a society provides the means of abolishing class differences on the other.

A corollary of this is that the difference between city and country is destined to disappear. The management of agriculture and industry by the same people rather than by two different classes of people is, if only for purely material reasons, a necessary condition of communist association. The dispersal of the agricultural population on the land, alongside the crowding of the industrial population into the great cities, is a condition which corresponds to an undeveloped state of both agriculture and industry and can already be felt as an obstacle to further development.

The general co-operation of all members of society for the purpose of planned exploitation of the forces of production, the expansion of production to the point where it will satisfy the needs of all, the abolition of a situation in which the needs of some are satisfied at the expense of the needs of others, the complete liquidation of classes and their conflicts, the rounded development of the capacities of all members of society through the elimination of the present division of labor, through industrial education, through engaging in varying activities, through the participation by all in the enjoyments produced by all, through the combination of city and country – these are the main consequences of the abolition of private property.

It is in this very early work by Friedrich Engels where he initially mentioned the structure of a Communist Society and the conditions which allows a Classless Society to thrive, that is the Combination of Country and City. This was explored in more detail in Karl Marx's critique of the Gotha Programme, where he had stated the following:

Within the co-operative society based on common ownership of the means of production, the producers do not exchange their products; just as little does the labor employed on the products appear here as the value of these products, as a material quality possessed by them, since now, in contrast to capitalist society, individual labor no longer exists in an indirect fashion but directly as a component part of total labor. The phrase "proceeds of labor", objectionable also today on account of its ambiguity, thus loses all meaning.

What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. Accordingly, the individual producer receives back from society – after the deductions have been made – exactly what he gives to it. What he has given to it is his individual quantum of labor. For example, the social working day consists of the sum of the individual hours of work; the individual labor time of the individual producer is the part of the social working day contributed by him, his share in it. He receives a certificate from society that he has furnished such-and-such an amount of labor (after deducting his labor for the common funds); and with this certificate, he draws from the social stock of means of consumption as much as the same amount of labor cost. The same amount of labor which he has given to society in one form, he receives back in another.

Here, obviously, the same principle prevails as that which regulates the exchange of commodities, as far as this is exchange of equal values. Content and form are changed, because under the altered circumstances no one can give anything except his labor, and because, on the other hand, nothing can pass to the ownership of individuals, except individual means of consumption. But as far as the distribution of the latter among the individual producers is concerned, the same principle prevails as in the exchange of commodity equivalents: a given amount of labor in one form is exchanged for an equal amount of labor in another form.

Hence, equal right here is still in principle – bourgeois right, although principle and practice are no longer at loggerheads, while the exchange of equivalents in commodity exchange exists only on the average and not in the individual case.

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly – only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!

What had separated Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' envisionment of Communism from the general Communisation Theory was an actual STRATEGY towards the achieving of a Classless Society with Common Ownership of Properties. It was stressed that the Private Property and Class Societies thrive because it had created the very Material and Organisational Conditions which allows it to reproduce. If we are to take a look at Bourgeois Society for example, it is characterised by an extremely scarce amount of Social Property, unevenly scattered across the Nation with numerous miscellaneous infrastructure in between, such as Shops, et cetera. It is by the eventual multiplication of Social Property and the gradual combination of Industry and Agriculture in large Society, will the conditions that will allow Communism to function without bringing about stagnation or even a decline in the mode of production finally be created.

The Proletarian State

If there is one critique all forces of Reaction across both the Conservative AND Socialist spectrum agrees on when it comes to the Revolutionary Programme written by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels for the transition towards a Classless, Communal Society, then they will all yell out in a Choir "The usage of an Authoritarian, Centralised State will only create a tyrannical Dictatorship that rules over the Workers instead of liberating them!" Indeed it would seem that Communism actually was all along a Statist ideology since it was called out by the common Bourgeois economist contemporary to the founding Fathers of Marxism whom were behind the defence of "Bourgeois Morality", alongside with the Russian Anarchist Mikhail Bakunin, another fellow Socialist who was infamous for his feud with Karl Marx that ultimately got him expelled from the International Workingmens' Association, the very feud in question was over Bakunin's perceived "Absolute Liberatarianism" against Marx's "Absolute Authoritarianism".

The historical representatives of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels would not help appeal their case of slander in the high court of the Cologne Communist Trial. The Bolshevik Party which would be responsible for the October 1917 Coup, had its entire ideology centred around the schools of thoughts of Vladimir Illyick Ulyanov, better known by his pseudonym as Vladimir Lenin, had his revolutionary methodologies plagiarised straight from the works of Pyotr Nikitich Tkachov, who himself was a Blanquist that believed in the seizure of Political Power by a Centralised, Revolutionary Vanguard organisation on BEHALF of the Working Class. It is now that we must give the chance for Marx and Engels to explain what they themselves actually have to say about this slanderous claim about Marxism made by Reactionaries, as well as those forces that continues to Bastardise Marxism's name an therefore continues to produce reserve supplies for the forces of Reaction in their quest to crush Communism and Workers' Liberation.

What will be used against Marx and Engels in their trial will be their planks proposed in their earlier works.
In Friedrich Engels' Principles of Communism, he had stated the following:

(i) Limitation of private property through progressive taxation, heavy inheritance taxes, abolition of inheritance through collateral lines (brothers, nephews, etc.) forced loans, etc.

(ii) Gradual expropriation of landowners, industrialists, railroad magnates and shipowners, partly through competition by state industry, partly directly through compensation in the form of bonds.

(iii) Confiscation of the possessions of all emigrants and rebels against the majority of the people.

(iv) Organization of labor or employment of proletarians on publicly owned land, in factories and workshops, with competition among the workers being abolished and with the factory owners, in so far as they still exist, being obliged to pay the same high wages as those paid by the state.

(v) An equal obligation on all members of society to work until such time as private property has been completely abolished. Formation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

(vi) Centralization of money and credit in the hands of the state through a national bank with state capital, and the suppression of all private banks and bankers.

(vii) Increase in the number of national factories, workshops, railroads, ships; bringing new lands into cultivation and improvement of land already under cultivation – all in proportion to the growth of the capital and labor force at the disposal of the nation.

(viii) Education of all children, from the moment they can leave their mother's care, in national establishments at national cost. Education and production together.

(ix) Construction, on public lands, of great palaces as communal dwellings for associated groups of citizens engaged in both industry and agriculture and combining in their way of life the advantages of urban and rural conditions while avoiding the one-sidedness and drawbacks of each.

(x) Destruction of all unhealthy and jerry-built dwellings in urban districts.

(xi) Equal inheritance rights for children born in and out of wedlock.

(xii) Concentration of all means of transportation in the hands of the nation.

What is perhaps more striking in this case however is this statement drawn from their [Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels] infamous Communist Manifesto:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the populace over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c, &c.

It is amongst these planks that Marx and Engels had advocated for the extraction and centralisation of Taxation, Infrastructure, Social Property and Financial Expenditures all in the hands of a STATE! This must mean the validity of Marx's supposed Statism in that case, does it not? In a strange twist of events, we hear from Engels in this statement written in his literature "The program of the Blanquist Fugitives of the Paris Commune":

Blanqui is essentially a political revolutionist. He is a socialist only through sentiment, through his sympathy with the sufferings of the people, but he has neither a socialist theory nor any definite practical suggestions for social remedies. In his political activity he was mainly a "man of action", believing that a small and well organized minority, who would attempt a political stroke of force at the opportune moment, could carry the mass of the people with them by a few successes at the start and thus make a victorious revolution.From Blanqui's assumption, that any revolution may be made by the outbreak of a small revolutionary minority, follows of itself the necessity of a dictatorship after the success of the venture. This is, of course, a dictatorship, not of the entire revolutionary class, the proletariat, but of the small minority that has made the revolution, and who are themselves previously organized under the dictatorship of one or several individuals.

These conceptions of the march of revolutionary events have long become obsolete, at least for the German worker's party, and will not find much sympathy in France, except among the less mature or the more impatient laborers. We shall also note, that they are placed under certain restrictions in the present program. Nevertheless our London Blanquists agree with the principle, that revolutions do not make themselves, but are made; that they are made by a relatively small minority and after a previously conceived plan; and finally, that they may be made at ally time, and that "soon". This purely negative term does not apply to them any more, for they maintain no longer merely a theoretical, but rather a practical opposition to the belief in God. They are simply done with God, they live and think in the real world, for they are materialists. This will probably be the case in France also. But if it were not, then nothing would be easier than to see to it that the splendid French materialist literature of the preceding century is widely distributed among the laborers, that literature; in which the French mind has so far accomplished its best in form and content, and which, with due allowance for the condition of the science of their day, still stands infinitely high in content, while its form has never been equalled since.

But this cannot suit our Blanquists. In order to show that they are the most radical, God is abolished by them by decree, as in 1793: "May the Commune for ever free humanity from this ghost of past misery (God), from this cause of its present Misery." (The non-existing God a cause!) There is no room in the Commune for priests; every religious demonstration, every religious organisation, must be forbidden."

What we see here is the critique of the Blanquist revolutionary program by Engels which he himself had
identified it as and criticised it for its presentation of an ideology advocating for the seizure of Political Power by a MINORITY.

In Karl Marx's critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of right, this important statement is written:

The separation of the political state from civil society takes the form of a separation of the deputies from their electors. Society simply deputes elements of itself to become its political existence. There is a twofold contradiction: (1) A formal contradiction. The deputies of civil society are a society which is not connected to its electors by any 'instruction' or commission. They have a formal authorization but as soon as this becomes real they cease to be authorized. They should be deputies but they are not. (2) A material contradiction. In respect to actual interests . . . Here we find the converse. They have authority as representatives of public affairs, whereas in reality they represent particular interests.

In Karl Marx's Work "The Jewish Question", he goes into a further analysis of the role of the State:

Where the political state has attained its full degree of development man leads a double life, a life in heaven and a life on earth, not only in his mind, in his consciousness, but in reality. He lives in the political community, where he regards himself as a communal being, and in civil society, where he is active as a private individual, regards other men as means, debases himself to a means and becomes a plaything of alien powers. The relationship of the political state to civil society is just as spiritual as the relationship of heaven to earth. The state stands in the same opposition to civil society and overcomes it in the same way as religion overcomes the restrictions of the profane world, i.e. it has to acknowledge it again, reinstate it and allow itself to be dominated by it. Man in his immediate reality, in civil society, is a profane being. Here, where he regards himself and is regarded by others as a real individual, he is an illusory phenomenon. In the state, on the other hand, where he is considered to be a species-being, he is the imaginary member of a fictitious sovereignty, he is divested of his real individual life and filled with an unreal universality.

What is now clear is that in reality Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels truly had DESPISED all ideas of Political Power in the hands of a Minority, even if the opportunity presents itself for the Minority to be elected by the populace as in Parliamentary elections, it was made clear that the State Deputy always will have the Authority to willingly defy the interests of those who elected them, as well as being legally obliged to follow the interests of the entire Constitution which itself is hostile to "Civil Society". It is from these statements made by Karl Marx in his earlier writings which simply debunks all Reactionary claims about Marxism's Statist tendencies. The Marxist concept of a Proletarian State should now be fully understood through Marx's direct response to Bakunin's accusation of his supposed "Statism" in his Conspectus on Bakunin's Statism and Anarchy:

We have already stated our deep opposition to the theory of Lassalle and Marx, which recommends to the workers, if not as final ideal then at least as the next major aim -- the foundation of a people's state, which, as they have expressed it, will be none other than the proletariat organized as ruling class. The question arises, if the proletariat becomes the ruling class, over whom will it rule? It means that there will still remain another proletariat, which will be subject to this new domination, this new state.

It means that so long as the other classes, especially the capitalist class, still exists, so long as the proletariat struggles with it (for when it attains government power its enemies and the old organization of society have not yet vanished), it must employ forcible means, hence governmental means. It is itself still a class and the economic conditions from which the class struggle and the existence of classes derive have still not disappeared and must forcibly be either removed out of the way or transformed, this transformation process being forcibly hastened.

If there is a state [gosudarstvo], then there is unavoidably domination [gospodstvo], and consequently slavery. Domination without slavery, open or veiled, is unthinkable -- this is why we are enemies of the state.

It means that the proletariat, instead of struggling sectionally against the economically privileged class, has attained a sufficient strength and organization to employ general means of coercion in this struggle. It can however only use such economic means as abolish its own character as salariat, hence as class. With its complete victory its own rule thus also ends, as its class character has disappeared.

Will the entire proletariat perhaps stand at the head of the government?

In a trade union, for example, does the whole union form its executive committee? Will all division of labour in the factory, and the various functions that correspond to this, cease? And in Bakunin's constitution, will all 'from bottom to top' be 'at the top'? Then there will certainly be no one 'at the bottom'. Will all members of the commune simultaneously manage the interests of its territory? Then there will be no distinction between commune and territory.

The Germans number around forty million. Will for example all forty million be member of the government?

Certainly! Since the whole thing begins with the self-government of the commune.

The whole people will govern, and there will be no governed.

If a man rules himself, he does not do so on this principle, for he is after all himself and no other.

Then there will be no government and no state, but if there is a state, there will be both governors and slaves.

i.e. only if class rule has disappeared, and there is no state in the present political sense.

This dilemma is simply solved in the Marxists' theory. By people's government they understand (i.e. Bakunin) the government of the people by means of a small number of leaders, chosen (elected) by the people.

Asine! This is democratic twaddle, political drivel. Election is a political form present in the smallest Russian commune and artel. The character of the election does not depend on this name, but on the economic foundation, the economic situation of the voters, and as soon as the functions have ceased to be political ones, there exists 1) no government function, 2) the distribution of the general functions has become a business matter, that gives no one domination, 3) election has nothing of its present political character.

The universal suffrage of the whole people...

Such a thing as the whole people in today's sense is a chimera --

... in the election of people's representatives and rulers of the state -- that is the last word of the Marxists, as also of the democratic school -- [is] a lie, behind which is concealed the despotism of the governing minority, and only the more dangerously in so far as it appears as expression of the so-called people's will.

With collective ownership the so-called people's will vanishes, to make way for the real will of the cooperative.

So the result is: guidance of the great majority of the people by a privileged minority. But this minority, say the Marxists...

Where?

... will consist of workers. Certainly, with your permission, of former workers, who however, as soon as they have become representatives or governors of the people, cease to be workers...

As little as a factory owner today ceases to be a capitalist if he becomes a municipal councillor...

and look down on the whole common workers' world from the height of the state. They will no longer represent the people, but themselves and their pretensions to people's government. Anyone who can doubt this knows nothing of the nature of men.

If Mr Bakunin only knew something about the position of a manager in a workers' cooperative factory, all his dreams of domination would go to the devil. He should have asked himself what form the administrative function can take on the basis of this workers' state, if he wants to call it that.

From the information we have extracted and went over, this Workers' State, sometimes referred to as the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat", was referred to by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels as the Workers' State that was built during the seizure of the Parisian City by the Central Committee of the National Guards during the end stages of the Franco-Prussian War. The State is nothing but the instrument of oppression one Class uses to assert its dominance over the interests of the oppressed Classes. The Bourgeois State is an institution funded by Capital and Private Property, and uses its mechanisms, the Police and Standing Military to brutally protect what brings it into existence. The Workers' State will use the very same mechanism, the barrel of loaded guns to terrorise all Classes that stand outside of and in opposition to the Working Class. It must constitute the entire Working Class as armed members of the State, and in doing so by replacing all Police and Standing Militaries with Popular Militias.

It is now that we should look towards Friedrich Engels' short text "On Authority" for a crude understanding of the course of establishing Communism using a Proletarian State.

A number of Socialists have latterly launched a regular crusade against what they call the principle of authority. It suffices to tell them that this or that act is authoritarian for it to be condemned. This summary mode of procedure is being abused to such an extent that it has become necessary to look into the matter somewhat more closely.

Authority, in the sense in which the word is used here, means: the imposition of the will of another upon ours; on the other hand, authority presupposes subordination. Now, since these two words sound bad, and the relationship which they represent is disagreeable to the subordinated party, the question is to ascertain whether there is any way of dispensing with it, whether — given the conditions of present-day society — we could not create another social system, in which this authority would be given no scope any longer, and would consequently have to disappear.

They demand that the first act of the social revolution shall be the abolition of authority. Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon — authoritarian means, if such there be at all; and if the victorious party does not want to have fought in vain, it must maintain this rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionists. Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of this authority of the armed people against the bourgeois? Should we not, on the contrary, reproach it for not having used it freely enough?

The prospect of using the Proletarian State during the earlier stages of the Social Revolution as a means of forcefully imposing Proletarian will upon other Classes is reflected in Engels' work Anti-Dühring, where he had stated:

As the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist.

It is after the defeat of the Reactionary forces and with Proletarian State established as the supreme Authority, then Political Authority would have become superfluous, and the Proletarian State by definition would have ceased to be a State and have its administrative functions fully directed towards the measures of building Communism, as Engels had stated again in Anti-Dühring:

The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in one sphere after another, and then ceases of itself. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the processes of production. The state is not "abolished", it withers away.

It is during this stage of development after the defeat of the Reaction that the Proletariat still needs to overcome the Material Conditions of Society laid out by the Bourgeoisie and eliminate the Scarcity of Productive Instruments, and in the Principles of Communism and the Communist Manifesto where it is laid out for us the methods for which to most efficiently expand production [of Industry and Agriculture] while at the same time providing a better standard of living for the Working Class, measures that included:

(iv) Organization of labor or employment of proletarians on publicly owned land, in factories and workshops, with competition among the workers being abolished and with the factory owners, in so far as they still exist, being obliged to pay the same high wages as those paid by the state.

(ix) Construction, on public lands, of great palaces as communal dwellings for associated groups of citizens engaged in both industry and agriculture and combining in their way of life the advantages of urban and rural conditions while avoiding the one-sidedness and drawbacks of each.

(xi) Equal inheritance rights for children born in and out of wedlock.

Above all, it will have to take the control of industry and of all branches of production out of the hands of mutually competing individuals, and instead institute a system in which all these branches of production are operated by society as a whole – that is, for the common account, according to a common plan, and with the participation of all members of society.

In the further development of the Material Conditions leading to the Common Ownership of Property, the association itself in one sphere or another will be rendered smaller in size, until it will at in the future, still exist only as a means of coordinating small, Communal projects such as response to natural Calamities affecting the means of Production. It is with the gradual elimination of the division of labor which will characterise the gradual change in the act of Labor itself, as Friedrich Engels pointed out in “On Authority”:

Let us take another example — the railway. Here too the co-operation of an infinite number of individuals is absolutely necessary, and this co-operation must be practised during precisely fixed hours so that no accidents may happen. Here, too, the first condition of the job is a dominant will that settles all subordinate questions, whether this will is represented by a single delegate or a committee charged with the execution of the resolutions of the majority of persona interested. In either case there is a very pronounced authority. Moreover, what would happen to the first train dispatched if the authority of the railway employees over the Hon. passengers were abolished?
But the necessity of authority, and of imperious authority at that, will nowhere be found more evident than on board a ship on the high seas. There, in time of danger, the lives of all depend on the instantaneous and absolute obedience of all to the will of one.

We have thus seen that, on the one hand, a certain authority, no matter how delegated, and, on the other hand, a certain subordination, are things which, independently of all social organisation, are imposed upon us together with the material conditions under which we produce and make products circulate.
We have seen, besides, that the material conditions of production and circulation inevitably develop with large-scale industry and large-scale agriculture, and increasingly tend to enlarge the scope of this authority.

It is now clear that the Marxist conception of the State is not an elite group meant to take power on behalf of the Proletariats, but rather the entire Proletariats organised as their OWN Government through the usage of Workers' Councils. It did not oppose Democracy in any way, and was in all its glory as anti-bureaucratic as a form of State can become, even more so than the present day Bourgeois Parliament.

The ideology of Marxism

The full sources of information will all be linked below in the section relating to the samples used in the justification of what true Communism is. It is not a Society whereby automatised individuals work for the Government representing the so called “Collective Good”, regardless of whether there is equal income or not, but rather a Society whereby the Government has been abolished entirely and has been replaced by an Association, and whereby the Common Ownership of Property renders the concept of Class Society asunder, and consequently a Society in which true Individuality is allowed to thrive, free from nuclei of Authoritarianism such as those ideologies which deems certain codes of conducts as “Objectively Ethical”. It is only with the Common Ownership of Property that the antithesis between Work and Individual life can be coincided, and that Individuals Work is not at the expense of the producer but the direct action and fruit of non other than the producer.